



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/017,785

12/13/2001

Michael C. Sanders

1662-39100 (P98-2403)

6110

22879

7590

01/12/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DEBERADINIS, ROBERT L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2836

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/017,785

Applicant(s)

SANDERS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert DeBeradinis

Art Unit

2836

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/23/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The reply filed 10/27/05 consists of remarks related to rejection of claims and addition of new claim 25.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument, see remarks related to JONES, filed 10/27/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-5, 7, 14-18 under 102a have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of O'Conner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-5, 7, 14-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Conner Us 2003/0056125.

Regarding claim 1-3, 7, 14-18, 20.

O'Conner discloses a plurality of modular server chassis (figure 3), each chassis configured to hold a plurality of servers (12, 64, 66) and at least one data aggregator coupled to each server in the same chassis via a point to point link (inherent in the system to assemble data for transfer); at least one group of AC to DC power supplies (22a-d, 74a-d, 76a-d); a power bus bar configured to transmit power from the power supplies to a power backplane in each server chassis (paragraph 0028); wherein DC power is provided to each server in the rack through the power bus bar and the power backplane in the same chassis.

Regarding claims 4, 5.

O'Conner discloses the computer server rack of claim 3.

O'Conner is silent wherein the aggregator is an IP network switch or an Infiniband network switch. These networks are well known in the art and it would be an inherent property to the system to include an aggregator that was compatible with the network it was communicating with.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2836

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 8-13, 19, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Conner Us 2003/0056125.

Regarding claims 6, 8-13.

O'Conner discloses the method of claim 7 and the desire to provide redundancy features (0003).

O'Conner is silent as to coupling the second switch to each server in the chassis with the same point to point network.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the server rack to include a second switch to each server in the chassis with the same point to point network. The motivation would be to provide redundant coupling for each server.

Regarding claim 19.

O'Conner discloses the server chassis of claim 18.

O'Conner is silent wherein the power backplane further comprises a fuse between the power supply and each device slot.

Protecting a device with fuses is well known in the art. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the server rack to include a fuse between the power backplane and the device slot to protect the power backplane from a potential short circuit caused in the device.

Regarding claims 21.

O'Conner discloses the server chassis of claim 16.

Art Unit: 2836

O'Conner is silent as to a specific link.

The links claimed are well known in the art it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill to provide the means to interface with the desired link.

Regarding claims 22-25.

O'Conner discloses the server chassis as claimed.


O'Conner is silent as to VHDM connectors, 1U width blades, 6U vertical height blades.

The above items are well known in the art. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to design a backplane and chassis with the above items to package a given system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert L. DeBeradinis whose number is (571) 272-2049. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on (571) 272-2058. The Fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

RLD

JANUARY 5, 2006



ROBERT L. DEBERADINIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER